

Reference to this class can be found on pages 97 (Engagement) and again 364 (Categories of engagement) in the English translation of Gyalsap Je's commentary. Reference to the *Heart Sutra* is at the second half of page 366.

Begin first of all by adjusting your motivation, and think that you're here on this occasion to receive the most profound mahayana teachings, with the ultimate aim of reaching the state of enlightenment in order to be able to benefit all mother sentient beings. With this thought please adjust your motivation for listening.

We continue where we left off last week. We'll continue with a new verse that says

"By seeing that, from entering the differentiation of the thusness of ordinary beings, aryas, and complete buddhas, it is taught as the heart of the Conqueror in sentient beings."

With this we begin with "entry," and entry is number six. Remember we have the whole list of:

1. identity
2. the cause
3. the result
4. the function
5. possession
6. entry

We are starting with that (number six).

Here we're looking at "entry," and we're looking at entry in three cases. You can say it's entry of the tathagata essence in three bases or in three types of individuals. It says "from entering the differentiation of thusness," of:

1. ordinary beings
2. aryas
3. complete buddhas

So we're looking at three occasions, we are making a division here. We are talking about the tathagata essence. We say that this exists in the occasion of ordinary beings; it exists in the occasion of aryas, and aryas, here, are still learner or trainee aryas; and in the case of complete buddhas. The sentence begins by saying "by seeing." Who is the one seeing? What type of seeing is it? This is direct seeing of suchness, this is direct seeing of emptiness. This is something that the Buddha does. The Buddha has this direct perception of suchness, and by seeing this he is actually teaching the heart of the conqueror – that is the tathagata essence, to sentient beings. So he sees it exists in three different occasions, and he teaches that to sentient beings.

What this sentence is saying is that the Buddha has actually taught that the tathagata essence or the buddha potential exists in all sentient beings. What was the occasion, or, where did the Buddha teach this? He taught that in the sutras. Then the question is how did he actually deliver this teaching, how did he explain that the Buddha nature exists in all sentient beings? He explained that by going into this classification, or into this "differentiation," and said that, when we talk about tathagata essence you can see that you can find this in the case of ordinary beings. In the case of ordinary beings they actually have not abandoned any of the stains. They possess all the stains. So they remain in a state of complete impurity. Although they are in this state of complete impurity still the tathagata essence enters this category of beings. In other words it exists for this category of beings. Then you continue by saying that the tathagata essence also exists for trainee aryas. Trainee aryas are in the state of purity *and* impurity. They are halfway there because they have abandoned *a certain measure* of stains, which are seeing abandonments and meditation abandonments according to their levels. So they have partial purity, not complete impurity. And then, finally, it says it also exists in complete buddhas who have the state of utter and complete purity because

they have abandoned not only every stain but also the imprints of those stains. So the Buddha said the way that this tathagata essence exists in three occasions, so he talked about differentiation and classification in three contexts.

The next question is for what purpose did the Buddha teach that? The reason was because he wanted to help beings to generate the non-conceptual pristine wisdom. In other words he wanted to help sentient beings generate the direct realisation of emptiness. And then the question is to whom did he give this teaching? Since this is a Mahayana Sutra the teaching was given to bodhisattvas.

The first sentence, as is usually the case, is the brief teaching, the meaning in brief, and then after that we go into more extensive explanation. So it continues by saying:

"(1) Ordinary beings possess wrong engagement. (2) Seeing truth reverses (that). (3) tathagatas (see) reality without wrong engagement, without proliferation."

Here we have what is understood as the differentiation of entry. If you see in the small letters, in the headings, we have that at the beginning. He begins by explaining "ordinary beings possess wrong engagement." In terms of wrong engagement, ordinary beings possess this wrong engagement in relation to the four such as impermanence and so forth. So,

1. being in the nature of suffering,
2. being impermanent,
3. being selfless,
4. being empty

And, also they possess wrong engagement due to having afflictions such as attachment. What differentiates sentient beings is that they have wrong engagement.

Ordinary beings will have wrong engagement in terms of the view. Then, for the next one, where it says "seeing truth reverses that," is talking about arya beings. The arya beings have a different way of seeing. They see the truth, and in that way they reverse that wrong engagement, and therefore they have correct engagement of the view.

The aryas have reversed this, they have reversed wrong engagement, so they have correct engagement. The entry, in the case of the aryas, is correct by means of abandoning whichever measure of stains and seeds of the stains is appropriate, according to their level. We're talking about seeing abandonments and meditation abandonments.

Then we come to the third sentence here that refers to the buddhas, the complete buddhas, and it says "tathagatas see reality without wrong engagement, without proliferation." The tathagatas, the buddhas see reality exactly as it is, having completely correct engagement because they have completely abandoned all stains and their imprints, and they are without proliferation of dualistic appearances.

We're talking here about this tathagata essence, and we have said, in the beginning, when we examine the nature we say that the nature is the nature of having this natural purity from the beginning, and that nature is found undifferentiable to all. So the same nature applies to sentient beings, to aryas, to buddhas. The same nature is found to whatever is the state of the mind, but later on we come and say yes, but we recognise there is differentiation from the point of view of the *basis* of that mind. You have occasions of the mind of the ordinary being that possesses all the stains; you have the occasion of the arya beings that possess a mind that is only partially purified from stains, so it's a state of purity *and* impurity; and finally you have the occasion of the buddhas where you have complete purity. So from the point of view of the basis there is differentiation. From the point of view of the nature, it is the same thing, they possess the same thing.

What we are seeing here is that we're examining the basis of the emptiness, and that basis is the mind. Really, we're discussing here the potential or the emptiness of the mind, and when we discuss the emptiness of the mind we're looking at

the basis, which is the mind itself, and because we recognise different states of purity with relation to that basis we start describing the emptiness of that mind, also in those terms.

In the case of ordinary beings the mind that they have is the mind that possesses stains. In this case we are talking about "the tathagata essence with stains." In nature it is without stains but because it refers to a mind that possesses stains, in order to indicate that it refers to this category, we're talking about "tathagata essence with stains."

In the second case, when we're dealing with the aryas, they possess a mind of incomplete purity. So, they possess a mind that has abandoned a certain measure of stains and their seeds, whatever is appropriate for them, so then we refer to "the tathagata essence of the mind that has abandoned a certain measure of stains and their seeds."

Then we come to describing the tathagata essence in the mind of the buddha. The mind of the buddha is a mind that has complete purity because it has completely abandoned all stains and their imprints. And then we end up talking about "the essence of tathagata in the state of complete purity that has completely abandoned all stains and their imprints."

The essence of the tathagata, then, is referred to in three occasions, by adding to it those additional words, "it is with stains," "it is with having abandoned a certain measure of stains," and "having a complete abandonment of all stains and imprints."

Don't become confused in that because we know that the nature of the essence of the tathagata refers to the natural purity, there's no other essence, there's only one essence, there is no differentiation. But from the point of view of adventitious stains there is differentiation because it can be referring to the mind with stains, partial removal of stains or complete removal of stains.

So, when you hear that term that says "suchness with stains," it is actually describing, more precisely, the *basis* of that suchness, and it's telling you that that basis possesses stains, and we are talking about the emptiness of that mind with stains.

In *dbu ma dgongs pa rab gsal*, there is this sentence that says "the more you purify the mind with stains, the more you purify the suchness of the mind with stains." So why is it expressing it in this way? Because he's saying you are purifying the *basis* of emptiness, and then the way that we refer to the emptiness of that basis also changes, we qualify it in a different way because it is referring to the fact that they are one in nature but two distinct isolates.

There is actually one debate about this point, that appears in *The Ornament*. The debate comes from, let's say, "the opponents," and what the opponents are saying is that in reality there is no differentiation in the sphere of emptiness, in the sphere of purity. And therefore, *they say*, it is not suitable to talk about different lineage or different individuals. This is how they posit it. *Our response* to that is that it is suitable to do that from the point of view of 'what is within the container.' In this example, imagine that you have three containers that are identical, there's no difference from the point of view of the container whatsoever, however you put different things in the container. The text talks about different types of water. He says you put one type of water in the first container, another type of water in the second container, a third type of water in the third container. It says from the point of view of the difference of the water, then, we talk about the containers in different terms. So, Geshe la is interpreting this example, and he says you have three plastic containers. In one you put honey. In the other one you put yoghurt. In the third one you put water. The containers are the same, there's no difference. But because you are putting different substance inside the containers, now you describe the containers as being "the honey container," "the yoghurt container," "the water container," so from the point of view of what is *inside* the container you are making a differentiation, you're making a distinction in the container. In reality the containers are the same, no difference whatsoever, but because they contain different things we call them in a different way.

Just as in the example of the three containers, similarly here, in terms of the emptiness of the mind there is no differentiation whatsoever, however because there is difference in terms of the *basis*, and there is difference in terms of the paths, or the

intention, the thoughts, and so forth, for that reason we do have differentiation in three lineages which is the lineages of the three vehicles. This debate and the answer to it are found in *The Ornament*.

We continue now with the next one, which is number seven, "the context." This is going to be given again, first of all with short teachings, and then with a more extensive explanation. For the initial short teaching it says:

"(1) impurity, (2) the purity of the impure, (3) utmost purity are called in order (the potential of) (1) sentient beings, (2) bodhisattvas, and (3) tathagatas."

We're talking about three different contexts.

You can see here that we are making a differentiation according to the context, according to the occasion. There is a debate or an objection from someone who says that if you begin differentiating the essence of the tathagata and you say that it is differentiated or it is classified into three, the fault that arises from that is that the essence of the tathagata from one becomes many. It was one, now you tell me it is three. And *our answer* to that is to always keep in mind that in terms of nature it is the same, there is no differentiation, but in terms of the context, in terms of the occasion, the special individuals that we examine, yes, there is difference. So we say there is only differentiation from the point of view of the basis. In terms of the its own nature which is the natural purity there is no differentiation.

It begins by talking about "the impurity, the purity of the impure, and the utmost purity." Remember here we are talking about the potential which is the essence of the tathagata, and in just the previous paragraph he has said that from the point of view of the basis or due to the state of the basis we start applying names, specific names to that essence of the tathagata, and in the first case, or the first category, we're talking about "the essence of the tathagata with stains." This qualification "with stains" refers to how many adventitious things exist in the mind that possesses that essence of the tathagata. So here it comes and gives the first term, the term "impurity." "Impurity" indicates the state of ordinary beings who have not abandoned any of those adventitious stains. It is referring to the essence of the tathagata with stains in the mind of ordinary beings who have not abandoned any of the stains yet. He's carving out one context, this is one context. Then it goes into the second one which is "the purity of the impure," so obviously this is a situation where you have a certain amount of purity and a certain amount of impurity, it is referring to the essence of the tathagata existing in the mind of arya trainees. They have abandoned whatever they are capable of in terms of seeing abandonment or meditation abandonments, and what they abandon is imputed afflictions. However much they can. However much is appropriate for their level. They have that mixture of purity and impurity. Now we're talking about "the tathagata essence of the pure and the impure," the second category. And then we're talking about "the tathagata essence of the utmost purity." Why? Because the basis that possesses that tathagata essence is completely totally purified, having abandoned the two types of obscurations along with their imprints. It has described tathagata essence in three contexts, and then it says, in order, these are called "the potential of sentient beings", which is the first one--the impurity; "the potential of bodhisattvas", and when it says bodhisattvas here we understand that they are trainee aryas, and "the potential of the tathagata" in the case of utmost purity.

In terms of the essence of the tathagata there is no differentiation from the point of view of its nature, of its identity, because it is that natural purity that exists there from the beginning. However, from the point of view of the basis that possesses that emptiness, that has that emptiness, there is differentiation in three contexts.

Gyalsap Rinpoche is actually making a comment here, saying: "It is proclaimed, or it is called, in other words it is imputed, as the tathagata essence of sentient beings, tathagata essence of bodhisattvas, the tathagata essence of the Tathagata because it is from the point of view of describing the state of the basis. In the case of sentient beings it has impurity, has not abandoned anything; in the case of trainee aryas it has abandoned whatever is appropriate according to their level; in the case of the tathagata it has complete purity, having abandoned both obscurations and their imprints." So, he says "It is merely imputed as the tathagata essence of sentient beings, the tathagata essence of aryas, the tathagata essence of the Tathagata--of

the Buddha, the same way that we impute the person upon the collection and the continuum of the aggregates." He makes that point that it is imputed as that but it is not the collection of the aggregates, the aggregates are not the person, the person is imputed upon the aggregates. He says "they are imputed as the tathagata essence of sentient beings, of bodhisattvas, of tathagatas."

Then Gyalsap Rinpoche goes into a more detailed explanation on this point. He says "it is similar to what we find in the *Heart Sutra* in the section where it says "form is emptiness, emptiness is form." He says the reason why we use that expression which is an abbreviated expression it's because we begin by analysing what is the mode of existence, what is the final nature, the final mode of existence of form. When you analyse the final mode of existence of form you find that it does not possess even a single atom of true existence. That form that has this property of not possessing even an atom of true existence, if it has that property, that thing is suitable to be imputed or designated as "form." You can then call it "form" knowing that it possesses that ultimate nature. It says, similarly, similar to that type of designation that we do with form, here we are looking at three bases that are empty of inherent existence but are suitable to be designated as the tathagata essence of the sentient beings, the tathagata essence of arya, the tathagata essence of the tathagata.

We have dharmas or phenomena that have this basic quality, that are lacking inherent existence, and are designated as something. He's saying in the first case we are designating the term "tathagata essence of sentient beings." Why do we designate this, or in what context do we designate this? When can you use that particular term? You use that term when you're talking about the emptiness of the mind that has not abandoned any stains. This thing is going to be called "the tathagata essence of sentient beings." Then he says look in another context, we want to use a different term. The term is going to be "the tathagata essence of a trainee arya." When do you use this term? You use this term when you want to describe the emptiness of the mind of someone who has abandoned a certain measure of stains, not all, just a certain measure. And then there is another context, another occasion, where we want to apply a different term. The term is "the tathagata essence of the Buddha", of the arya Buddha, but we can call it the Buddha. You apply this when you're dealing with the emptiness of the mind that is completely purified, and possesses the utter purity. In one context you use this term, in another context you use the other term, and so forth.

That was the brief. We're going now to the extensive explanation.

The extensive explanation says

"Potential subsumed by the six meanings of identity etc., is taught by three names, in three contexts."

We have here the three names: "the tathagata essence of sentient beings", "of trainee aryas", and "of complete Buddha." It says that these three names are actually teaching the six meanings. What are the six meanings? They are the six meanings of identity and so forth, if you go into the list.

We're on number seven, we're on context, and he says in number seven which is context you're given three names, and basically these three names they can teach you in brief the previous six in the list. We have a list of ten principles, and the list is:

1. identity
2. cause
3. results
4. function
5. possession
6. entry
7. context (the material we're covering now)
8. omnipresent meaning
9. never transforming
10. undifferentiable qualities

It says 1-6, the meaning of these can be taught by the three names that you are taught on number seven which is the context.

If we look at the list of six [which is part of the list of ten], the first one is (1) the identity, or the nature, it's talking about the state of purity. Number two is (2) the cause which is the purifying causes that will allow you to establish that state of purity. And then we have (3) the result, (4) function, (5) possession, and (6) entry. Whatever is the meaning that is taught in those six points or six principles, whatever we understand from these six principles is then summarised and condensed in the seventh principle, (7) context. The seventh principle is just telling us that there are three different occasions or three different contexts, and in these three different contexts we have to use three different names, and we do that because the level of purity, the causes of purification, the function and so forth are in a different state in each one of the contexts. This is why we use it in this way. It takes whatever is taught in the previous six points and it summarises it, and it tells us that we have three contexts here so we have to use three different names.

When you're talking about the potential which is the tathagata essence—every instance, every example, every case of potential has to fall in one of those three categories. Either it is going to be the potential of a mind with stains, or it's going to be the potential of mind with partial purity, or it's going to be the potential of the mind of complete purity. There is no other potential that exists that does not fall in any of these three categories.

Student: When we said before, the definition of potential or wisdom is designated as a substantial cause for enlightenment, the potential is a designated substantial cause for enlightenment. How come it's the "potential of a tathagata?" Isn't the tathagata already enlightened? So how come we say its the "potential of a tathagata?"

You have to just keep thinking about the emptiness of the mind, if you examine the emptiness of the mind you can see that these can be described in three different occasions. Even when you are a buddha, where you have the two types of purity, so you have complete purity, you can still talk about the emptiness of that mind that has complete purity, you can talk about the tathagata essence of the tathagata, of the buddha. Otherwise when you're just talking about potential, or buddha lineage, or buddha potential—the buddha potential does not exist in the buddha because the buddha has already actualised the potential. The potential exists up to the point before becoming a buddha. So if you are just using the term "potential" as 'the potential to become a buddha' that's causal and that does not exist for the buddha, but if you talk about the emptiness of the mind, explain the term as referring to the emptiness of the mind, then you can talk about the emptiness of the mind of the buddha.

Gyalsap Rinpoche, in his commentary, says the buddha has actually taught many synonyms and many different terms for emptiness, at times he taught two types of emptiness, at other times he said there are four types of emptiness, at other times he said there six, there are eighteen, there are twenty types of emptiness. The Buddha himself has given many synonyms and many different names teaching the same thing. There is no contradiction whatsoever between these presentations or the different sets of names and terms that we have, and similarly here whatever is the nature that is taught in the previous context (the previous context is the first six presentations that we had so far), in terms of the potential (the potential is to be understood as referring to the emptiness of the mind, here "potential" is a synonym or another term for the emptiness of the mind), here the way that the potential is taught in these previous six contexts is taught by the Buddha by giving it three names, and there is no contradiction by giving these three different names. The three different names that are given are given from the point of view of the basis which is the mind itself, according to the way that it exists in different contexts at different times, and that's why it is given three names which is “the tathagata essence of sentient beings”, “of aryas”, and “of tathagatas.”

He continues by explaining that, we have three categories or three contexts of impurity, purity and impurity, and utter purity that actually refer to how much of the adventitious stains you have eliminated. In the first case--the case of impurity you have not eliminated anything; in the second case where you have purity and impurity you have eliminated some of those adventitious stains; and in the third case of utter purity you have completely eliminated all of those impurities and stains. So

it says, because we have that differentiation from the point of view of the basis, for that reason we apply different names, we impute the names "potential of sentient beings," "potential of trainee arya's," "potential of the buddha."

Remember that quotation in *dgongs pa rab gsal* where it says "the more you purify the mind, the more you purify the suchness of the mind," or the emptiness of the mind. Actually it is very very relevant to what we're saying here. We are saying that we have the mind, and then we're looking at the emptiness of the mind. So we are observing very closely what is happening to the mind, because according to the state of the mind we're going to label, or we're going to designate the emptiness of that mind. When that mind has not abandoned any adventitious stains we say that the mind is "stained," and at that point we're talking about "the emptiness of the mind with stains," and it can be abbreviated as "the emptiness of the stained," or "the stained emptiness." It refers to the emptiness of the mind with stains.

Then you make some progress and you abandoned a certain measure of abandonments in your mind, and then the emptiness that now refers to that mind that is partially purified is going to be "the partially purified emptiness," or "the emptiness of the partially purified mind." And when you have "complete purity of the mind" you will have "the emptiness of complete purity," "the emptiness of the mind that is completely purified," and this actually comes down to the point of explaining why in the consequence school we say that the truth of cessation *is* actually emptiness. How does it reflect to this material? We have the mind that is going to be the basis of emptiness, and then we have the emptiness of that mind, so whatever is happening to that mind--to that basis is going to be reflected as an additional term that is added to the emptiness of that mind. So when the mind has stains we have "the emptiness of stains," "[the emptiness] of the mind with stains." When it has partial purity, "the emptiness of partial purity," when it has complete purity, "the emptiness of complete purity." You begin with a mind that has stains, and then you progress along the path and you start abandoning adventitious stains. You cannot obtain cessation unless you abandon some of those adventitious stains. Let's say you're at the level where you are abandoning stains of the path of seeing, so, "seeing stains." You have the mind that abandons adventitious stains related to the path of seeing. So now you have the emptiness of that mind that has abandoned some stains. Previously it was the emptiness of a stained mind, now it has become the emptiness of a partially purified mind. It has changed. Some qualification of that has changed. When you reach that point you actually begin meditating on the emptiness of the mind itself because you realise: "previously I had emptiness of mind with stain, now I have emptiness of mind of partial stain," so you meditate on that emptiness of the mind itself. You meditate on the emptiness of the transformation of the emptiness of the mind. The more you work on that, the more you refine that realisation, this is how you will then progress into the next level of abandonment. It is that understanding that is designated as the truth of cessation, realisation of the emptiness of the transformation of the emptiness of the mind.

Actually this is quite an important point because the way that the lower schools explain cessation is quite different from the way that the Consequence School accepts cessation. Actually, the Consequence School cannot accept any of the things that they posit as cessation, as being cessation. The lower schools say that the truth of cessation refers to the abandonment of afflictions, and by saying they are "the abandonment of afflictions," they mean ceasing or stopping the continuum of afflictions, ceasing or stopping the causes of afflictions, abandoning the causes of afflictions. "Absence", "abandonment" and "ceasing" for the lower schools are posited as the truth of cessation. These will never qualify for truth of cessation for the Consequence School because for the lower schools destruction or ceasing is a permanent phenomenon, is non-compounded phenomenon, it's permanent for them. For them you achieve something permanent, you stopped, you ceased it, and it's forever ceased, but for the Consequence School ceasing or destruction is *not* permanent, it is impermanent. So it cannot be posited as the truth of cessation. The other alternative is that it refers to their absence, or non-presence. Again that is not cessation for the Consequence school because while you are in the uninterrupted path, afflictions are absent because you apply their antidotes. Their absence is temporary under these conditions. So it cannot just be that, and ceasing or destruction is impermanent for the Consequence School.

The same thing is reflected in the use of the term "nirvana with remainder," and "nirvana without remainder," and again we say that the Consequence School has its own way of presentation when it comes to explaining what it is with remainder and what it is without remainder. For the other schools, they say that, when we talk about "with remainder," they are referring to the case of an arhat. An arhat obtains nirvana with remainder and then later on they obtain nirvana without remainder. The term, here, "remainder," refers to whether you still have the continuum of suffering remaining, or whether you have severed that, you have stopped that continuum of suffering. They say that whilst the arhat still possesses the body, in other words whilst the arhat is still alive, because this body is a body of contaminated aggregates they still have this remainder with them despite their realisations. They are still carrying that remainder of contamination, the contaminated aggregates that means that the aggregates still exist, so they still have that continuity of contamination of suffering. When they pass away, when they die, there's nothing left of these aggregates that was this contamination they still had with them, and then they obtain the nirvana without remainder. The order that it happens to for them is that first you have nirvana with remainder because you obtain that level once you are still alive, and then you pass away and you have nirvana without remainder. So the Consequence School, again, comes and says that, look, here we are talking about how much of this continuum of afflictions is present. If it is just the case that afflictions are not present then they say this is something that you can have in the uninterrupted path, just the absence of afflictions for that time. But, when you have that, you have not obtained truth of cessation because to obtain truth of cessation you must have moved into the liberated path which comes after the uninterrupted path. So they say, either you are talking to me about a case of being still on uninterrupted path, or if you're talking about destruction of afflictions, "destruction," for you, is something permanent, but it's something, which for us, is impermanent, so it cannot be posited as the truth of cessation. So for the Consequence School, when we talk about "with remainder" and "without remainder," this refers to whether you still have remaining appearance of true existence. If you still have that thing you have nirvana with remainder. If you don't have it, you have nirvana without remainder, and the order in which you obtain these in the Consequence School is the opposite from the order presented in the lower schools. For the Consequence School, first you obtain nirvana without remainder because first you are in equipoise, and when you are in the state of equipoise you don't have any appearance of true existence, and then you move into post-equipoise, and those appearances reappear again. So you go from nirvana without remainder to nirvana with remainder, so it's the opposite order.

It is very interesting to look at what it means, how do we understand the term "abandonment," or "severing something," or "stopping something"? In particular, within this school, the Consequence School. The Consequence School says that if you talk about abandonment, or about exhaustion, or stopping something, and this is just the thing not being there, this, we cannot posit as a truth of cessation because you can have the mere absence of that thing when you are still on the uninterrupted path. Uninterrupted path is not the truth of cessation. Then they say if you're going to say that it is the destruction of that thing, then for the consequence school destruction is actually a compounded, an impermanent phenomenon, but cessation cannot be impermanent phenomenon. They say you cannot have something impermanent presented as the truth of cessation.

Why is it that the Consequence School says that destruction is actually impermanent, that it is a compounded phenomena, so in other words it's active, they're saying destruction is active? Because, actually they say you cannot have production or generation of something unless the previous state is destroyed, and therefore it is due to the destruction of the previous state that we have the generation of the next stage. Therefore they posit the destruction as being an agent, an impermanent active agent that produces things. So when you ask the question to a follower of the Consequence School, why was this thing produced? The answer is: because the previous state was destroyed. That's the only answer. This is what explains the production. Destruction explains production, and therefore destruction is impermanent, is not permanent, and therefore it cannot be the truth of cessation.

So then the question is, okay so what are you going to define as the truth of cessation? What is the truth of cessation for this school? And they say, it's just as we say, look at this, the emptiness of the mind. We're going to explain it here through the example of the sky and the clouds. It's all about the emptiness of the mind and seeing the purity of the mind, but at the same

time having adventitious stains. Adventitious stains are like the clouds in the sky. You're looking at the sky and you're saying "I have sky with clouds," this is how you describe it, and then the clouds go away and you're left with this vacuity, this clarity, this sky without any clouds. They say that thing is the truth of cessation.

Away from the example now, if you look at the actual thing that we are looking at, we talk about the emptiness of the mind, but initially that mind has stains, so initially you're talking about the emptiness of the mind with stains, then you progress a little bit along the path, some purification takes place, so now you can talk about the truth of cessation. The truth of cessation is to realise that, now, you're talking about the emptiness of the mind that has got rid of a certain amount of those adventitious stains, that the emptiness of the mind itself, in a sense it has changed—in the sense that the basis has changed. The mind is now a bit more purified. Before you had all the stains, now it has only some of the stains. So that thing, just to see the emptiness of the mind that has now become the mind with only some of the stains, that, they say, is the truth of cessation.

The truth of cessation is the transformation of the emptiness of the mind that has stopped or abandoned some stains.

It comes down to this, the truth of cessation *is* emptiness, and when you have not abandoned any stains at all, you don't have truth of cessation. You start talking about truth of cessation only after you have abandoned some of those stains, only then you can talk about cessation.

Geshe La: We have eight minutes, do you have any questions? We will stop here otherwise.

Student: So, it's abandoned of *some* stains, not all stains? Because truth of cessation can be in the mind of a bodhisattva, right?

Geshe La: Yeah, truth of cessation, when you talk about cessation, there are many different levels of cessation. Not necessarily has to be abandon whole of afflictive emotions. So, as we...

As we say that afflictions come in many different levels, so cessation, also, is going to come in different levels. The more you abandon of those afflictions, the more different level of cessation you will obtain.

Geshe La: Any other questions? We will stop here today.